

FILED - USDC -NH
2022 MAR 9 AM 10:28

5638

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Josephine Amatucci

v.

town of Wolfeboro, et al

BASICALLY CASE 449

NOT NOT NOT 21-CV-1081

RESPONSE TO THE
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
DATED FEB. 28, 2022
STATING A VOID JUDGMENT IS NEVER FINAL

1. In her Report & Recommendation Magistrate Johnstone named as a defendant in my lawsuit, "JUDGE" Charles Greenhalgn, but I never named a JUDGE as a defendant, I named an individual by the name of Charles Greenhalgn, so I have NO IDEA what Johnstone is talking about, when she gave Greenhalgn, acting as an individual, JUDICIAL IMMUNITY. This is called an ABUSE OF PROCESS, when the Magistrate is setting in motion an unconscionable scheme to dismiss the Plaintiff's meritorious claims. In a matter of an obstruction of justice.
2. Charles Greenhalgn was not acting as a judge, had no jurisdiction to Act, and therefore had no judicial immunity. He knew all along there was no

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

...the ...

Assault with Bodily Injury , there was no victim, and he had the duty to dismiss the Complaint. And in not doing so, he violated Due Process. and lost all jurisdiction to hear the case. Where therefore his judgments and decisions were VOID OF NO LEGAL FORCE. bu continuing to hear the case he had no authority to hear.

3. When a judge knows that he lacks jurisdiction, or acts in the face of clearly valid Constitutional rights, he expressly deprives himself of jurisdiction, judicial immunity is lost. Rankin v. Howard, Davis v. Burris 51 Ariz. 220, 75 P.2d 689 (1938). The Illinois Supreme Court held that "if a judge has no jurisdiction, then he and those who advise and act with him, or execute his process, are TRESPASSERS". Von Kettler v. Johnson. Under Federal law the U.S. Supreme Court stated that if a court is "without authority, its judgments and orders are regarded as nullities. They are not avoidable but simply VOID AND FORM no bar to a recovery sought, even PRIOR TO A REVERSAL IN OPPOSITION TO THEM. Judge Greenhalgn was engaged in treason. U.S. v. Will 449 U.s. 200, 216 101 S.C. 471, 66 L.Ed.2d 392, 406 (1980).

4. Void judgments NEVER DIE, "Rulings made in violation of Due Process are VOID. Reid v. Balter (1993) 14 Cal. App.4th 1186. When a judge does not follow the law they are TRESPASSORS OF THE LAW, they lose jurisdiction and his orders are VOID OF HE LEGAL FORCE OR EFFECT. Scheur v. Rhodes (1974).

A VOID JUDGMENT IS NEVER FINAL

5. As far as the Belnap Sheriffs dept. is concerned they also violated Due Process, when they KNEW that there was no Assault with Bodily Injury, yet they maliciously prosecuted the Plaintiff for the crime. And in doing so they are accused of

a malicious prosecution, without probable cause, violating the Fourth Amendment for her unlawful detention she had to endure during the trial, for the loss of her liberty, all WITHOUT PROBABLE CAUSE. Fraudulent Concealment, where there are no restrictions under Fraud.

6. Yet with all the exculpatory evidence before the court, the court with flimsy pretexts is trying to dismiss the case.

A VOID JUDGMENT IS NEVER FINAL

7. The claims of an unlawful detention, a loss of liberty, a malicious prosecution all without probable cause, in a violation of Due Process, are MERITORIOUS CLAIMS that were never litigated ON THE MERITS.

A VOID JUDGMENT IS NEVER FINAL

8. Magistrate Johnstone never addressed the evidence in the record where a statement was made by the alleged victim Robert Maloney, who stated very clearly that there was NO INJURY. Judge Johnstone never addressed that the Plaintiff was being prosecuted WITHOUT PROBABLE CAUSE. So how could the case result in a final judgment ON THE MERITS.

9. In the 531 case Judge DiClerico addressed his ruling WITHOUT PREJUDICE, he stated that the Plaintiff was not arrested, seized or taken into custody and therefore there was no fourth amendment claim. He was wrong, as according to the United States Supreme Court in the case of Albright v. Oliver, the court stated that a detention for having to appear in court is a "SEIZURE" under the Fourth Amendment. That there is no requirement to show a favorable outcome in the criminal proceeding except to show an UNLAWFUL UNREASONABLE 'SEIZURE'

10. Therefore this court cannot say that under Res Judicata this ruling by DiClerico was

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

on the merits. And remember he stated his ruling was WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

A VOID JUDGMENT IS NEVER FINAL

11. Therefore, this case will be litigated under a Civil Rights violation, and under an individual named Charles Greenhalgn, who lost all jurisdiction to Act in this case, and as an Individual Greenhalgn has no JUDICIAL IMMUNITY.

A VOID JUDGMENT IS NEVER FINAL

12. Therefore under my right to Redress my Grievences in Court, under my right to access the Courts, and under the fact that a VOID JUDGMENT and FRAUD IS NEVER FINAL, the Plaintiff will never stop defending her meritorious claims, and if the judges refuseS her right to a jury trial for the violations of her Civil Rights, the judge will be a TRESPASSOR OF THE LAW, and must step down from this case.

13. Don't anyone dare to threaten me with a restriction to address my meritorious claims, as a VOID JUDGMENT IS NEVER FINAL under the law, and under the First Amendment the court cannot restrict my right to access the courts.

14. Therefore, the Court will litigate and judge:

- (a) the unlawful malicious proecution without probable cause;
- (b) the unlawful detention and violation of her liberty rights;
- (c) the warrant that issued based on fraud;
- (d) a Fourth Amendment unlawful detention without probable cause;
- (e) a violation of Due Process;
- (f) the Sheriff and Greenhalgn knew there was no Assault with Bodily injury;
- (g) Greenhalgn had no jurisdiction to hear the case;
- (h) Greenhalgn's judgments and decisions are VOID OF NO LEGAL FORCE.
- (i) are Meritorious claims for damages under the LAW OF THE LAND.

(j) Unlawful Acts against an elderly 80 year old person.

15. And allow me a jury trial for damages as mandated under the Federal Constitutional law. Or they are TRESPASSORS of the law.

Respectfully,

Josephine Amatucci

March 8, 2022

c. town of wolfeboro, belnap sheriff's dept.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Josephine Amatucci". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned below the typed name.

under the terms of the license, the license is not

subject to the terms of the license, the license is not

subject to the terms of the license, the license is not

subject to the terms of the license, the license is not

subject to the terms of the license, the license is not